

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 20, and 29 have been amended, and claims 31 and 32 were added. Claims 2, 4-5, and 8-13 were previously canceled and claims 17 and 26 were previously withdrawn. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1, 3, 6-7, 14-16, 18-25, and 27-32 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

In the Office Action dated March 25, 2009, claims 1, 3, 6-7, 14-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,361,163 to Matsuda et al. ("Matsuda"). Claims 20-25 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,661,485 to Moon ("Moon"). It is noted that claims 1 and 20 have been amended. To the extent that the rejections remain applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicants hereby traverse the rejections as follows.

A. Matsuda

The Applicants' invention as now set forth in amended claim 1 is directed to a display panel for amplifying light reflection intensity, including at least the combination of a substrate, at least one protrusion disposed on a surface of the substrate, a light reflective layer deposited on the surface of the protrusion opposite the substrate, wherein the light reflective layer comprises programmable code information and the protrusion amplifies the light reflection intensity such that the programmable code information is optimally detected.

Fig. 4(a-d) of the present invention illustrates an exemplary placement of the substrate (41), protrusion (43), and light reflective layer (44). The protrusion (43) is disposed on the surface of the substrate (41), and the light reflective layer (44) is deposited on the opposite surface of the protrusion (43).

Matsuda discloses a substrate (411, 511) and a protrusion (412, 512) disposed on the substrate (411, 511). However, Matsuda teaches that the light reflective layer (421, 553) is located on the surface of the substrate (411, 511) rather than the protrusion (412, 512). See Figs. 22, and 26-28 of Matsuda. Claim 1 clearly recites that the light reflective layer is deposited **on the surface of the protrusion opposite the substrate**.

The Office Action on page 3, lines 2-3 states “if you flipped the whole display shown in Fig. 22 [of Matsuda] around then the reflective layer is on a surface of the protrusion.” However, regardless of rotating the display, the substrate in Matsuda is sandwiched between the reflective layer (421) and the surface of the protrusions (412).

Therefore, Matsuda does not disclose or suggest a display panel for amplifying light reflection intensity, including at least a light reflective layer deposited on the surface of a protrusion opposite a substrate, wherein the light reflective layer comprises programmable code information and the protrusion amplifies the light reflection intensity such that the programmable code information is optimally detected, as in amended claim 1.

For at least this combination of reasons, the Applicants submit that Matsuda does not disclose every element of amended claim 1.

Moon fails to cure the deficiency in Matsuda.

For at least this combination of reasons, the Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited art. As claim 1 is allowable, the Applicants submit that claims 3, 6-7, 14-16, 18-19, 29, and 31, which depend from allowable claim 1, are therefore also allowable for at least the above noted reasons and for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Claim 20 is directed to a liquid crystal display panel including in part a light reflective layer disposed on a surface of a plurality of protrusions opposite a substrate.

For similar reasons to those discussed above, the Applicants submit that claim 20 is likewise allowable over the cited art for at least this reason.

B. Moon

The liquid crystal display panel in claim 20 further comprises a plurality of color filters, wherein the light shielding layer and the light reflective layer are between adjacent color filters.

Fig. 3 of the present application illustrates exemplary color filters 35, wherein a light shielding layer (34) and a light reflective layer (33) are located between adjacent color filters (35).

The Office Action admits that Matsuda fails to disclose a plurality of color filters. The Office Action cites Moon, Fig. 5 as disclosing this feature.

In contrast to claim 20, Moon discloses color filters (132) separating a light shielding layer (134) and a pixel electrode (138), that the Examiner asserts may be reflective).

In claim 20, the light shielding and light reflective layers are located between color filters. In Moon, the light shielding layers (134) are not located between color filters.

Therefore, the Applicants submit that claim 20 is allowable over the cited art. As claim 20 is allowable, the Applicant submit that claims 21-25, 27, 28, 30, and 32, which depend from allowable claim 20, are therefore also allowable for at least the above noted reasons and for the additional subject matter recited therein.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.


Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge

any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to
Deposit Account No. 01-2300 with reference to Attorney Docket No. 025789-00006.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox LLP

for  *56, 127*
Sheree Rowe
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 59,068

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6000
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395